REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Final Office Action mailed February 21, 2007. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 23-25 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Reconsideration of the claims is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 23-25 and 28-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Shimizu, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,977). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because a *prima facie* case of anticipation can not be established based on the amendment presented above.

As the Examiner is aware, to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." Vergegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . . claim." Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

For instance, with respect to claims 1 and 28, Applicant has incorporated the limitations of claim 21 into these claims and has added additional limitations to clarify the contents of the first stream data. These limitations are added to more clearly identify that both the first stream data and the second stream data include video data and audio data. As set forth in the Office Action, the first stream data is construed as one or more commands transmitted from processor (110) to graphics and audio processor (114). *See Page 3 of the Office Action.* However, Applicant respectfully submits that the commands do not constitute the first stream data as now claimed.

One distinction between the claimed invention and the teachings of Shimizu is the presence of two or more processors, such as CPU (111) and stream processor (115) according to one embodiment of the invention, that collectively work to decode the stream data. The first processor is adapted to decode the first stream data (video data and audio data) sent over the communication bus while the second processor is adapted to decode the second stream data (video data and audio data) that is sent from the drive device without use the communication bus. With regard to video data and audio data, efficiency of data compression is being improved higher and higher. The more data is compressed, the more a processor takes time to decode the data. Therefore, the first and second processors share such burdensome processes of decoding video data and audio data. In contrast, Shimizu teaches the use of a single processor (graphics & audio processor 114) that is controlled by main processor (110) to decode images and audio with the assistance of a video encoder (120) and audio codec (122). *See col., 6, line 53 – col. 7, line 3 of Shimizu.*

Hence, in light of the amendments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the §102(e) rejection as applied to claims 1-3, 18-19, 21, 23-25 and 28-30.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Witt (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0109005). Moreover, claims 26-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shimizu in view of Ochiai (U.S. Patent No. 6,757,482). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

As the Examiner is aware, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify a reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. *See MPEP §2143; see also In Re Fine, 873 F. 2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2D 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).*

Applicant respectfully submits that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established because the combined teachings of the cited references fail to describe or suggest all of the claim limitations. However, based on the dependency of claims 20, 22, 26 and 27 on independent claim 1, believed by Applicant to be in condition for allowance, no further discussion as to the grounds for traverse is warranted. Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in an Appeal is warranted. Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection as applied to claims 20, 22, 26 and 27 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Authorization for Extension of Time, All Replies

Authorization is given to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136(a) for its timely submission, as incorporating a petition for extension of time for the appropriate length of time. If any other petition is necessary for consideration of this paper, it is hereby so petitioned. Please charge any shortage in fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 02-2666 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: May 16, 2007

By _____

William W. Schaal
Reg. No. 39,018
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025